

**MINUTES OF THE  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
AUGUST 19, 2024**

**PL(P) 24-25 and Z24-08-009 An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) and County AG (Agricultural) to City PUD (Planned Unit Development) for the properties identified as 4616, 4620, 4628, and 4634 South Holden Road, generally described as west of South Holden Road and south of Bishop Road (37.66 acres). (APPROVED)**

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties. He advised there is a Unified Development Plan (UDP) associated with the request, and that the applicant had proposed the following conditions:

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to a maximum of 118 single-family dwellings.
- 2) Maximum building height shall not exceed forty-five 45 feet.

Mr. Carter stated GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Exurban on the Future Built Form Map. If this original zoning request is approved, the Future Built Form designation for the subject site is considered to be amended to Urban General in order to ensure an appropriate fit between future land use designation and zoning. The GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map designates the property as Residential and Industrial. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling In Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The request also supports the Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices. The proposed PUD, as conditioned, is primarily intended to accommodate single-family detached residential development. The proposed original zoning request allows uses that are similar to existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Vice-Chair Magid asked staff if the annexation and rezoning request should be considered before the UDP.

Mr. Kirkman advised that the order of consideration to be the annexation, rezoning and then the UDP.

Vice-Chair Magid invited the applicant to the podium.

**Amanda Hodierno, 804 Green Valley Road**, said she was representing the applicant and gave a summary of the subject properties and noted that the site is just under 38 acres. She noted that the request is a single use PUD zoning district for a maximum of 118 single family dwellings. She said that the proposed density is equivalent that of R-3 single family residential zoning district. She noted the request is consistent with the GSO 2024 Future Designation Map designation of Residential. She stated water and sewer service are in proximity to the site which made the site suitable for growth.

Ms. Hodierne highlighted the existing conditions of the area and pointed out the subject properties are just south of the Interstate 85 corridor, the industrial uses north and southwest with residential neighborhood west of the request. She noted that the immediate surroundings is rural in nature with farmlands and single family homes. She pointed out the existence of another Interstate west of the properties created easy access and movements to and from the site. She stated the UPD is the governing document for the request. She said that the aim was to preserve the wooded areas, stormwater ponds and streams while keeping the dwellings concentrated in one area. She noted that there two access to the proposed site, both located on South Holden Road.

Ms. Hodierne spoke on the neighborhood outreach and stated that letters were mailed to property owners with the city's 750ft notification buffer. She said a meeting was Zoom meeting was held with roughly 8 persons attending. She mentioned that the top concern raised was traffic generation and said that a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was conducted for the request and submitted to the city for review. She informed the Commissioners that civil engineer for the project was present to answer any site design questions.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners.

**Mr. Downing** asked for clarification when the Zoom meeting was held.

**Ms. Hodierne** informed the meeting was held on August 5<sup>th</sup>.

Vice-Chair Magid invited the speakers wishing to speak in opposition to the podium.

**Jimmy Clark, 4514 South Holden Road**, said he is the owner of Guy M Turner Inc. and owned several properties in the area and one just north of the request. He stated the request was not compatible with the area. He mentioned Guilford County envisioned the subject properties to be heavy industrial. He said the current uses in the area are heavy industrial. He spoke of future industrial activities for his properties which would surround the proposed site. He listed other industrial uses in the area and noted that a landfill was also in the area. He said he has large fleet of 19 axle tractors trailers, he stated the trailers are the length of a football field. He explained the only way to get to his property is via Highway 220, exit Randleman Road, via Harris Street, via South Holden Road. He said that the trailers are escorted in and out of the area and traffic are at a standstill for approximately 45 to 1 hour.

**Mr. Engle** asked Mr. Clark if Interstate 40 and South Holden could be another option.

**Mr. Clark** said it was not an option. He said most of the traffic in the area are heavy duty trucks. He noted the prevailing wind in the area moved west to east and an asphalt plant is west of the request.

Vice-Chair Magid asked if the applicant wished to speak further in favor of the request.

**Amanda Hodierne, 804 Green Valley Road**, said she understood the concerns to be compatibility between industrial and residential. She stated that the GSO2040 Plan encourages mixed uses in a compatible manner to accommodate all the uses in demand such as housing. She acknowledged the success of the existing uses in the area and stated that the applicant has extensive experience

in residential site selections. She said that the applicant believed the subject properties are suitable for residential development and is aware of the land uses and activities in the area. She mentioned the request is reasonable and pointed out that a school is south of the request. She stated that there are other areas with similar mix of uses mentioning residential neighborhoods close to the airport, to the coliseum which are intense uses bringing a lot of intense traffic, noise and visual impacts. She said that a variety of housing choices are necessary. Ms. Hodierno talked about recent redevelopment of a factory in another residential neighborhood and stated that the city has always put uses next to each other and continue to do so.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to come forward to the podium.

**Lynn Clark, 4514 South Holden Road**, said the applicant's attorney stating that the GSO2040 Future designation residential zone for the area was incorrect. He said the proposed site was designated heavy industrial. He referenced the staff report and said the importance of having the character, existing development and trend in the area be as is, which is heavy industrial. He pointed out that the area has always been heavy industrial and would continue to be so. He said the request was not viable.

**Robert Mock, 4600 Big Poplar Lane**, noted his wife sent a letter to the Commissioners expressing concerns. He said he moved to the area to escape the crowded neighborhoods. He stated the proposed site abutted his property and would change the single-family character. He pointed out that the surrounding industrial uses protected his farm. He asked the Commissioners to support him in protecting the single family character.

**Derek Carson, 5340 Old Randleman Road**, said that the request is inconsistent with the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan noting that the existing land use in the area is industrial and the request being residential. He referenced the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and said that industrial lands should be protected for industrial opportunities. He stated should the request be approved the industrial lands in the area would be lost. He noted that the staff report stated the area future uses are residential and industrial and felt that both could not co-exist. He said industrial uses exist on all sides of the proposed site and repeated that the request is not suitable for the area.

**Patrick Short, 4617 South Holden Road**, stated he owned other lands surrounding the proposed site and he would like to use his properties for industrial development. He said he agreed with the presenters before him and stated the request is a satellite annexation. He asked if anyone visited the proposed site and experienced the heavy traffic in the area.

**Mr. Engle** said he flew over the site, and he got a feel for the traffic situation.

**Mr. Short** said he should be on the ground to experience the heavy traffic. He said the potential residents would not be able to get in and out of the site safely. He said the request does not fit in the area and asked the Commissioners not to support the request.

Vice-Chair Magid inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak further in opposition. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing. Vice-Chair Magid then asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners.

**Ms. Skenes** noted that she sat on the County Zoning Board when Bishop Road experienced industrial growth including the expansion of the landfill. She stated she did site visit on the weekend and agreed with Mr. Clark that heavy industrial use exist in the area. However, she noted that almost half of the area is designated residential. She said most of the industrial uses are along Bishop Road. She mentioned that residential developments also exist in the area and pointed out Mr. Short living adjacent to the proposed site. She stated that despite having industrial uses in the area and more so on Bishop Road, having a school nearby on Harris Street, she was not convinced that the area should remain solely for industrial uses. She noted her consideration should be based on the guidelines of the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and stated the future designation for the area is residential.

**Mr. Engle** stated that the area falls within the mix of Exurban and Industrial, and noted that the school influenced his decision. He described the existing land uses in the area and noted the request would be compatible with the surrounding use. He said the aim of the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan is to encourage complementary uses. He supported the request and encouraged continued discussion between the applicant and the residents.

**Mr. Gilmer, Sr** supported the request and noted that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan future designation for the area is residential.

**Mr. Downing** did not support the request and said that he understood the presence of the residential and industrial dynamics. However, he is not convinced that the residential use would be suitable given the anticipated industrial use in the area. He said that the applicant and the residents should continue working together.

Chair O'Connor concurred with Ms. Skenes, Mr. Engle and Mr. Gilmer, Sr and supported the request.

Mr. Engle made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Vice-Chair Magid. The Commission voted 6-2, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Gilmer Sr. and Turner). Nays: (Downing and Glass).

Ms. Turner then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-08-009, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the properties at 4616, 4620, 4628, and 4634 South Holden Road from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) and County AG (Agricultural) to City PUD (Planned Unit Development) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City PUD zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer, Sr seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 6-2, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Gilmer Sr. and Turner). Nays: (Downing and Glass).

Vice-Chair Magid advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, September 17, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Ms. Skenes made a motion to approve the UDP as submitted, seconded by Chair O'Connor. The Commission voted 6-2, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Gilmer Sr. and Turner). Nays: (Downing and Glass).